

and about making available this vital technology to the very poor women as well as to the rich.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are times when people of good faith who differ on an issue can come together and find a place to agree. I believe my legislation, H.R. 195, brings us beyond the shrill arguments regarding abortion and makes a meaningful effort to care for the mother and the child.

THE TIME FOR TRUTH AND CANDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, President Bush's televised speech on Sunday night, calling for tens of billions of dollars in additional funding to support the U.S. occupation of Iraq, was extremely disappointing, disappointing because the President failed to explain to the American people the details on how he is going to change this failing policy.

It is clear that his administration rushed to war with too little thought given to the implications of an American occupation of Iraq. We were not welcomed with open arms as some administration officials have predicted. On the front page of today's Washington Post is an article entitled "Spy Agencies Warned of Iraq Resistance," detailing how U.S. intelligence agencies warned the Bush Administration before the war that there would be significant armed opposition to a U.S.-led occupation. In all the many briefings I attended, I do not recall any administration official sharing that information. We have not found the weapons of mass destruction that we were told existed in such abundance.

And while the administration continues to link Iraq to the terrible tragedy of September 11, so far it has produced no evidence to support such a claim. In fact, the occupation of Iraq has increased the terrorist presence in that country, not lessened it.

On Sunday night President Bush had the opportunity to tell the American people of his plan, including his exit strategy for the brave American men and women who are serving in Iraq with such incredible distinction. Instead, the President detailed nothing.

This is a war that should never have happened. As awful as Saddam Hussein was, he was not an imminent or direct threat to the people of the United States. Months into the war, the Congress and the American people are still waiting to hear a clear, consistent and convincing justification for it. Why did we need to invade Iraq? What was so urgent that it required us to go to war when we did? Why could we not have spent the necessary time to build an international consensus on how to best

deal with Saddam? What was so threatening to our country that made this Congress spend only 1 day, 1 day debating the authorization authorizing war?

As of today, 284 brave young Americans have lost their lives and 1,450 have been wounded. And in preparation for this war, this Chamber could only manage to devote a single day in October debating it. That is shameful.

Now the President says he wants another \$87 billion and expects everyone to just go along, no questions asked. Mr. Speaker, like so many people throughout this country, I have a lot of questions and I am not prepared to just go along. I want to make sure that American troops have all the resources they need and I am not advocating that we walk away from our obligation to the people of Iraq. However, I also want to make certain that the hard-earned tax dollars of the American people are not wasted on more of the same. I have no problem with helping Iraq build hospitals, health clinics, schools, roads and housing. But I do have a problem with the lack of support by this administration for the building of hospitals and health clinics, schools, roads, and housing right here in the United States.

Why did the President not tell us on Sunday that in the face of this enormous price tag, he is willing to forego his tax cut for millionaires so that we can avoid going deeper into debt? If this is a time for sacrifice, then why do the people in the income bracket of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY not have to make any sacrifice? I cannot vote for 87 billion additional dollars without some accountability and some clarification. What is the plan? How long are we going to be there? Eighty-seven billion dollars is for just 1 year. What about next year or the year after that? How is the \$87 billion going to be spent? How were the \$79 billion we appropriated in April spent? We are now at \$166 billion and counting.

The President wants us to spend \$87 billion more mostly for Iraq. For months some of us have been trying to get just \$1.8 billion more for our veterans' health care only to be told by the administration that there is not enough money. We have been trying to get \$7 billion so that the Pell grant program fully lives up to its promise and students are not buried under a mountain of debt. The administration says no. We have been trying to get just \$300 million to fund the Global Food for Education Initiative, to provide a nutritious meal in a school setting for millions of children, but the administration tells us that the money just is not there.

The American people need to know what is at stake here. They need to know about the choices the administration is asking us to make. This is a time for truth and candor. We have had enough spin. We have had enough deception. This is also the time for this Congress to do what it failed to do be-

fore the war: ask the tough questions, demand the straight answers, and debate thoughtfully the implications of what we are doing. We must be more than a rubber stamp, and I would urge my colleagues respectfully to proceed with caution.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, my intention is to talk about the need for a prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare, but when I listened to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), he made it a point about the President's speech on Sunday night about how this \$87 billion in new funding that the President is requesting for Iraq is going to have a direct impact on domestic programs, and I have to say it was very disturbing to me today to read in the New York Times in the lead story on the front page that some Republicans were suggesting that because of the additional needs for Iraq as outlined in the President's speech that maybe some of them would now reconsider whether they would support a prescription drug benefit for seniors.

Let me tell the Members the Republican leadership in this House as well as the President have been saying for over 2 years that they are going to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors and there is no reason not to do it. The notion that somehow now we do not have enough money for it is bogus, given the fact that the Republicans passed all these tax cuts, a series of three tax cuts that now have put us into a deficit. In addition to that, the fact of the matter is if they were willing, which they have not been, to provide some kind of cost controls or some requirement that part of the Medicare prescription drug program would assume that the Secretary would negotiate lower prices for discounts, we would be able to afford a good prescription drug benefit.

I do not want to hear and I am not willing to listen to those Republicans who are going to tell us over the next few months that we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit. It is their own policies that have put us into this deficit situation. It is their own policies that make it difficult for us to negotiate any kind of price reductions or put any kind of price controls in effect because they oppose it ideologically.

It is interesting because earlier this week there was another article in New York Times that talked about the VA programs and how successful the veterans program has been in trying to keep costs down for prescription drugs, and that is because they negotiate price reductions. They insist as part of the VA program that when they buy

drugs in bulk that they get a discount price. We should be doing the same thing here for seniors in general. We should provide a prescription drug benefit that takes care of all seniors, regardless of their income as long as they are eligible for Medicare and also a prescription drug program that goes directly to the issue of price by saying that the Medicare administrator, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, should be empowered and should be mandated to reduce prices by negotiating price reductions because he now represents 40 million seniors who are part of the Medicare program.

Instead, the Republicans, because I know the conference is now going on between the House and Senate versions of this Medicare prescription drug bill, we hear the Republicans still insisting on the fact that they want to privatize Medicare, give senior citizens a voucher, and tell them that they have to go out and buy private insurance at some point in the future if they want to continue with their Medicare program in general. And then we are told that if they want to get any kind of prescription drug program under the Republican proposal, that they have to join an HMO because if they do not join an HMO or some kind of private program, they will not get the prescription drug benefit. That is bogus.

Today in the New York Times there was an article on page A-21 where they talked about fewer people on Medicare are being dropped by HMOs this year and the head of the Trade Association for HMOs was so proud of the fact that this year, or I guess next year, they estimate that only 39,000 to 40,000 Medicare beneficiaries will be dropped by their HMOs. So what? What about the fact that so many other seniors have been dropped by their HMOs in the last few years? It is estimated in this article that only about 11 percent of the 40 million seniors are now in HMOs or getting some kind of a drug benefit through their HMO. How in the world are the Republicans going to propose saying that the only way they get a prescription drug benefit is if they join an HMO, when only about 11 percent right now of seniors are in HMOs and fewer and fewer every day because even with this drop in the number that are essentially being dropped, there is still another 40,000 that will not be able to keep their HMO as a means of continuing with their Medicare?

The bottom line is, and this is what the Democrats have said, there is an obligation on this Congress and this President to pass a prescription drug bill that provides a prescription drug benefit to all seniors, whether or not they are in an HMO or not, and the Medicare prescription drug proposal should not be used as an excuse to privatize Medicare in general.

There is going to be a motion to instruct this week. I believe it is going to be proposed by my colleague from Maine, to make the point that the conferees should not require people to

have to join an HMO to get their prescription drug benefit and that we should not be moving down the road of privatizing Medicare, and we need to pass that motion, but we also need to have some kind of way of dealing with the issue of price. Otherwise, we are never going to be able to afford this prescription drug benefit.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT TESTING FAIRNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, last spring I received an e-mail from a sixth grade math teacher by the name of Dawn Spurr. Dawn teaches in a small town in my district, and she wrote to me just after she had given her students a standardized test that she did not feel fairly measured her students' progress. She told me that several of her students were very upset. Some even left the classroom in tears because they simply did not have enough time to finish the test even though she felt they knew the answers, and she was upset as a teacher because she will be judged based on how well her students perform on that test. As a result, she said in her letter, Congressman, "instead of teaching students, I am to teach a test."

As a result of this e-mail I received, today I am introducing a bill titled The Student Testing Fairness Act. This bill will address some of the problems with all of the new testing mandates contained in the No Child Left Behind law. Even though the test Dawn gave her students was not one mandated by the No Child Left Behind law, the law does mandate certain standardized testing procedures which will make the situation even worse.

The No Child Left Behind law establishes two important goals: First, the law requires schools to make all students proficient in reading and math by the year 2013-2014 school year. And, second, the law requires schools to close the achievement gap between subgroups of poor and minority students and their more affluent non-minority peers. The No Child Left Behind law requires annual testing in reading and math of all students in grades three through eight and once in grades ten through 12 beginning in the 2005-2006 school year.

Mr. Speaker, effective and appropriate standardized tests can be used to measure student progress and to target help where it is most needed. However, test scores alone cannot accurately measure a student's success or a school's success. Other measures such as attendance rates, dropout rates, and the percentage of students taking advanced placement tests all contribute to the overall picture of a school's success or failure. While the No Child Left Behind law does allow the use of mul-

tiple measures in assessing a school's success or failure, it provides no balance.

Test scores are always a prerequisite for a school's success, and other indicators cannot be used to help a school succeed even though they can be used to determine whether or not a school is sanctioned. This has very troubling consequences. For example, since schools cannot succeed by reducing dropout rates but they can incur sanctions if their test scores fail to show consistent annual improvement, they have little incentive to keep at-risk students who are more likely to get lower test scores from leaving school.

The Student Testing Fairness Act will give schools and teachers and students the flexibility to measure progress using more than just a single standardized test. Among several other provisions, my bill will give schools credit for any student improvement, not just improvement that brings a subgroup of students into the proficiency category. And my bill will ensure that help is targeted where it is needed by limiting public school choice and supplemental services to those subgroups of students who have failed to improve.

Standardized tests can work, but they are not the only answer, and I hope my colleagues will join me in ensuring that the educational reforms enacted by the No Child Left Behind bill are truly effective by passing the Student Testing Fairness Act into law.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed huge mandates from the Federal Government down to the States. We are underfunding those mandates by \$8 billion. As a result, students will drop out and teachers and schools will be unfairly punished.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

God of mercy and love, You offer all peoples of the Earth the dignity of sharing in Your life.

Strengthen the people of this Nation to overcome all racial hatreds and religious prejudices that we may truly be one Nation under God enlightened and free; a real witness of inner freedom to the world.